REMARKS

Claims 1-34 were pending. Claims 7-8, 16, 24, and 32-33 have been canceled. Claims 1, 4, 9, 10, 13, 17, 18, 21, 25, 26, 29, and 34 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-6, 9-15, 17-23, 25-31, and 34 remain pending subsequent entry of the present amendment.

Applicant notes and appreciates withdrawal of the prior rejections.

In the present Office Action, claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claim 4 to correct a lack of antecedent basis. Accordingly, the rejection is believed overcome. Claims 13, 21, and 29 have also been amended to correct a similar lack of antecedent basis.

In addition to the above, claims 1-34 stand rejected as being unpatentable over 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,265,221 (hereinafter "Miller") and U.S. patent 6,772,350 (hereinafter "Belani"). Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections and requests reconsideration in view of the following discussion.

As amended, claim 1 reads as follows:

"A method of community access control in a Multi-Community Node (MCN), said method comprising:

    receiving a request for access to an object;

    consulting a community information base (CIB) responsive to said request,
        wherein said CIB includes:
        a user community set (UCS) for each user of said MCN;
        an application community set (ACS) for each application on said MCN;
            and

an object community set (OCS) for each object residing within said MCN;

permitting access to said object in response to detecting:
said request is from a user; and
a UCS of said user is a superset of an OCS of said object; and

permitting access to said object in response to detecting:
said request is from a process; and
an ACS of said process is a superset of an OCS of said object."

In paragraph 12 of the present Office Action, it is suggested that Miller-Belani discloses the features of claim 8. In particular, it is suggested that Miller discloses a "CIB includes a UCS for each user of said MCN, an ACS for application on said MCN, and an OCS for each object residing within said MCN (Miller, col. 2, lines 42-67 & col. 3, lines 1-22 & col. 9, lines 16-26). However, Applicant submits these features are not disclosed by the cited art. With respect to claim 1, the cited art does not disclose the features:

"consulting a community information base (CIB) responsive to said request,
wherein said CIB includes:
a user community set (UCS) for each user of said MCN;
an application community set (ACS) for each application on said MCN;
and
an object community set (OCS) for each object residing within said
MCN".

In contrast to the presently claimed invention, Miller discloses an access control mechanism based upon explicitly entered "rules" comprising Boolean expressions. In the disclosure of Miller, access is determined based upon the evaluation and result of a Boolean expression. For example, Miller discloses:

"The rule memory 210 stores rule names with their associated boolean expressions." (Miller, col. 4, lines 21-23).

"Discretionary access control mechanisms are in the most reduced sense binary decisions: a subject is either allowed or not allowed to perform some action on some object. This concept can be stated as follows: the sentence "Subject may Verb Object" is either true or false. A general discretionary access control mechanism, therefore, should

have subjects, verbs, and objects as inputs to a boolean expression evaluator, as disclosed herein." (Miller, col. 7, lines 28-36).

"Rules are boolean expressions which must yield a true or false result (stored internally as "1"/"0"). (Miller, col. 10, lines 1-3).

As seen from the above, Miller discloses a different approach to access control than that of the presently claimed invention. Miller utilizes rule names which are associated with specified Boolean expressions. Consequently, Miller does not disclose the community information base (CIB) and its features as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits claim 1 is patentably distinct from the cited art. As each of independent claims 10, 18, and 26 include similar features, each of these claims are patentably distinct for reasons similar to that of claim 1.

Applicant believes the application to be in condition for allowance. However, should the examiner disagree, a telephone interview is requested by the below signed representative at (512) 853-8866.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5181-75800/RDR.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

☒ Return Receipt Postcard

Respectfully submitted,

Rory D. Rankin
Reg. No. 47,884
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin,
   Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: October 13, 2005